



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/531,225

04/13/2005

Helmut Winterling

12810-00072-US

4572

30678

7590

09/09/2008

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

1875 EYE STREET, N.W.

SUITE 1100

WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

LISTVOYB, GREGORY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1796

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/09/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/531,225	Applicant(s) WINTERLING ET AL.	
	Examiner GREGORY LISTVOYB	Art Unit 1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 10 objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

In particular, claim 10 merely repeats limitations of claim 1 and fails to further limit the independent claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 7, 9, 11-16, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hoyt et al (EP 0409093) herein Hoyt as evidences by Lombardi et al (US 3663511), herein Lombardi.

Hoyt discloses a fiber-forming polycaprolactam (see Page 2, line 50 and page 4, line 5) comprising a compound which includes at least one hydroxyl group and has chemical bonding by way of an amide group to the end of the polymer chain (see page

Art Unit: 1796

4, line 10), which includes at least one terminal hydroxyl group and wherein the compound which includes at least one hydroxyl group is present in the range from 0.001 to 2 mol%, based on 1 mole of amide groups of the polyamide (see page 4, lines 20-35).

Note that Hoyt does not teach a linear, unbranched alkanemonocarboxylic acid.

Instead, he teaches epsilon-caprolactone as a source of hydroxyl groups. Hoyt does not clearly disclose a mechanism of forming the above Hydroxyl groups from the lactone.

Lombardi evidences that during the reaction of hexamethylenediamine and epsilon-caprolactone or hydroxycaproic acid (see Example 2), the amide bond forms between amine and acid (see Column 5, line 10). Hydroxyl group stays unreacted (see Example 2). Lombardi teaches 6-Hydroxycaproic acid is equivalent to epsilon-caprolactone in amino-group blocking reaction (see Column 4, line 65).

Since formation of amide bond and hydroxyl group can be possible only in case of opening of the lactone ring, Hoyt's polyamide contains a linear, unbranched alkanemonocarboxylic acid residue.

Regarding claim 16, Hoyt teaches a dye in his polyamide (see page 4, line 40).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 2, 3, 8, 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoyt as evidenced by Lombardi.

Hoyt discloses a polyamide comprising a compound which includes at least one hydroxyl group and has chemical bonding by way of an amide group to the end of the polymer chain (see page 4, line 10), which includes at least one terminal hydroxyl group and wherein the compound which includes at least one hydroxyl group is present in the range from 0.001 to 2 mol%, based on 1 mole of amide groups of the polyamide (see page 4, lines 20-35).

Hoyt does not teach a linear, unbranched alkanemonocarboxylic acid.

However, Lombardi evidences that epsilon-caprolactone (used by Hoyt) and 6-hydroxycaproic acid are equivalent in amine-blocking reaction.

In the instant case substitution of equivalent methods requires no express motivation, as long as the prior art recognizes equivalency, In re Fount 213 USPQ 532 (CCPA

Art Unit: 1796

1982); In re Siebentritt 152 USPQ 618 (CCPA 1967); Graver Tank & Mfg. Co. Inc. V. Linde Air products Co. 85 USPQ 328 (USSC 1950).

Regarding Claim 8, the films based on Nylon 6 are well known. Hoyt film has low coloration (see Examples), which indicates their higher resistance to oxidative degradation. Also, Hoyt teaches that his polyamide has very good stain resistance (see Page 2, line 40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skills in the art to use Hoyt's modified polyamide in films, since they have good thermo-oxidative stability and stain resistance.

Claim 5-6, 17-18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoyt in combination with Brubaker (US patent 2264298, cited in the previous Office Action) as evidences by Lombardi.

Hoyt discloses a polyamide comprising a compound which includes at least one hydroxyl group and has chemical bonding by way of an amide group to the end of the polymer chain (see page 4, line 10), which includes at least one terminal hydroxyl group and wherein the compound which includes at least one hydroxyl group is present in the range from 0.001 to 2 mol%, based on 1 mole of amide groups of the polyamide (see page 4, lines 20-35).

Lombardi evidences that epsilon-caprolactone (used by Hoyt) and 6-hydroxycaproic acid are equivalent in amine-blocking reaction.

Hoyt, Lombardi does not disclose a method of preparing hydroxyl-capped polyamide. Instead, Hoyt teaches a reaction of polyamide with hydroxyl-containing compound.

Brubaker teaches a method of forming of hydroxyl terminated polyamide, comprising a reaction of caprolactam and hydroxyl-containing amine (see Example 3). Brubaker teaches that his polyamide contains 0.002 % mol of hydroxyl group based on 1 mol amide group (see Example 3).

Brubaker's method has at least two advantages over Hoyt process. Firstly, Brubaker teaches one-step method, compare to two-step process of Hoyt (the first step comprises a synthesis of a polyamide, whereas the second one includes modification of the polymer). Second advantage is that the hydroxyl-containing reagent fulfills the role of a chain length regulator in the Brubaker's process.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skills in the art to include caprolactone or hydroxycaproic acid in the synthesis of Hoyt/Sato's polyamide in order to obtain more economical one-step process and optimize molecular weight of the polyamide with the above reagents.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 6/24/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the polyamide prepared according to Hoyt produces no water whereas the polyamide prepared in the disclosure produces water as a by-product and this water forming reaction leads to a polyamine with different physical properties including equal or higher melt volume rate as noted above. Therefore, the use of epsilon-caprolactone is not equivalent to 6-Hydroxycaproic acid as the office has suggested with regard to Lombardi.

However, Applicant admits on the record (see Response from 6/24/2008) that the structure of polyamide, produced by Hoyt and one claimed by the Applicant are identical. (see page 3 of the Remarks).

In addition, claim 1 claims individual polyamide, but not a composition based on polyamide. Water can not be part of polyamide claimed

Examiner agrees with the Applicant that Sato does not meet the above limitation. Therefore, rejection, based on Sato is withdrawn.

Note that Sato was used in the previous Office Action in alternative basis with Hoyt. Therefore, the rejection under 35 USC 102(b) based on Hoyt alone sustains.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GREGORY LISTVOYB whose telephone number is (571)272-6105. The examiner can normally be reached on 10am-7pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 571-272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Rabon Sergent/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

GL